

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Official Action mailed February 13, 2006. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully considered.

Specification

The Action was said to be responsive to the papers as filed. It is assumed that the preliminary amendment to the specification and abstract as filed on November 2, 2004 have been received and approved for entry. Acknowledgement to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Information Disclosure Statement

The examiner indicated that the IDS submitted on June 10, 2004 was not considered because an English translation of the Japanese language document was not provided. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The cited document was mentioned in the specification as filed, at page 1, as exemplary support for the admission (in the Description of the Related Art) that microchip lasers having a thin solid-state laser medium have been developed as small laser oscillators for achieving low-order, longitudinal-mode oscillation and obtaining beams of a desirable shape. Further discussion of semiconductor lasers is included at pages 1 to 3 of the specification as filed. In the cited document, the Abstract is in English as are the captions for the figures; thus, at the very least, those portions of the document should have been considered, as well as the admissions in the specification as filed.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for the cited Japanese document, or at the very least its English portions.

Claims

Claims 1 to 5 are pending in this application as examined.

Claim 5 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include the subject matter of its base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 5 is rewritten to

include the subject matter of its base claim 2. The subject matter of claims 3 and 4 is added as claims 6 and 7, but dependent on allowable claim 5, so claims 5 to 7 are allowable, independently of a submission of a certified copy of the priority document.

Claim 1 was initially rejected as anticipated by the publication to Yee, while claims 2 to 4 were rejected as being obvious over Yee in view of Kadowski. These positions are respectfully traversed. As recognized by the examiner, upon submission of the accompanying certified translation of the priority document, Yee is removed as a reference and the rejections should be withdrawn. It is noted that the actual filing date of this application is February 27, 2004, and its priority date is March 26, 2003, a date that precedes the filing date of the Yee publication of December 30, 2003.

Conclusion

Claims 1 to 7 are allowable over the art of record, noting that original claim 5 was allowable so that claims 5 to 7 are independently allowable and that claims 1 to 4 are allowable because of the submission of a certified copy of the priority document antedating Yee, see MPEP 201.15.

Dated: May 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorney for Applicant